

# CBIE RESEARCH

Canadian Bureau for International Education

*Millennium Series - N° 2*

## Taking the Pulse: Monitoring the Quality and Progress of Internationalization including tracking measures

By Jane Knight, Ph.D.

### PREFACE

The intention of the first paper I wrote for CBIE entitled *Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints* (Knight, 1994) was to focus on internationalization indicators. At that time I was uncomfortable with the notion of quantitative data being used as indicators of whether an institution was internationalized or not. For instance, would 'x' number of international agreements/projects, 'y' number of international students and 'z' ratio of domestic students on study abroad be accurate or even useful indicators of internationalization. Instead, the idea of elements/strategies for internationalization was introduced and a set of checkpoints was developed.

Now, six years later, I still have the same discomfort with quantitative information being used as sole indicators of internationalization, but I have increasing interest in how to evaluate the quality and progress of internationalization efforts. Therefore, this paper introduces the concept of qualitative and quantitative tracking measures to enable a monitoring of progress and quality toward specified objectives or targets. Tracking measures are categorized according to the different elements that were identified and described in the original paper. The major elements are still relevant today but there are new complexities to them and also additional ones to consider.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Internationalization of higher education will be remembered as one of the major challenges and accomplishments of the last two decades. But, for what will it be remembered? Will it be seen as a positive or negative influence? To help answer these questions we need to direct more efforts toward monitoring and evaluating the progress, quality, results and impact of our internationalization efforts. This paper looks at why and how

we should give more attention to the quality and progress of internationalization.

Recent studies and surveys (Bolton, 1997; CBIE, 1998; Knight, 2000) indicate that the Canadian higher education sector has seen an increase in the importance and attention given to supporting internationalization, especially in the last twenty years. The growing interest has translated into the development of policies, programs and infrastructure at both institutional and government levels. While this expansion and investment in internationalization are welcomed and needed, we must ensure that we are 'doing the right things' and 'doing things in the right way'.

The focus of this paper is on tracking the quality and progress of our internationalization efforts at the institutional level. To sharpen our focus on the evaluation of internationalization strategies, at both macro and micro levels, is the logical next step in our endeavor to integrate an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching/learning, research and functions of higher education institutions.

#### 1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this paper is threefold: 1) to emphasize the importance of monitoring and evaluating internationalization initiatives; 2) to introduce some preliminary measures to track the progress and quality of different elements and strategies of internationalization; and 3) to review existing quality assessment and assurance instruments which can be applied to internationalization.

In the proposed internationalization cycle (Knight, 1994), there were six major phases described. The phases were not discrete as there is considerable overlap between each phase. However, there was a logical sequence of the stages in the cycle: awareness, commitment, planning, operationalize, review and reinforce. As internationalization comes of age and we move through the different phases of the cycle, both at the sector and



institutional levels, it is appropriate and timely that we are now focussing more on evaluation. One new approach to evaluating internationalization strategies includes the tracking measures proposed in this paper.

The draft tracking measures should not be interpreted as performance indicators of internationalization. If internationalization is seen as a process, these tracking measures are meant to help in the evaluation of the progress and quality of the process. They are not intended to assess the results or impact of internationalization. However, the evaluation of results is critical and is the next step we need to undertake.

The concept of tracking measures is not new to higher education but it is relatively new to internationalization. Therefore, the quantitative and qualitative measures included in this paper are a 'work in progress'. They are in draft form only and are being made available for institutions to test and provide feedback to CBIE on how to improve them.

## 1.2 Assumptions

Assumptions which guide the thinking in this paper fall into two major categories. The first relates to the way terms are defined and used. The second group of assumptions relate to the fundamental approaches used to examine the relationship between quality and internationalization.

### 1.2.1 Terminology

There continues to be frequent misuse and misunderstanding of the terms internationalization and globalization. These concepts are often mistakenly used as interchangeable terms. International and global are two very different terms. The former refers to the relations between and among nations. The latter refers to the world or globe as a whole, where the idea of nation state is not pertinent (Knight, 1999b).

For the purpose of this paper, internationalization is defined as the "process of integrating an international/intercultural perspective into the teaching/learning, research and service functions of a higher education institution (Knight, 1994). Globalization is understood to be the "the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, ideas .... across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation's individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Internationalization of education is a response to globalization" (Knight, 1999b).

Quality is a very complex and sometimes rather nebulous term. The meaning used for this paper is fully explored in Section 2.1. but, in short, quality is used in the sense of 'excellence, enhancement and fitness to purpose'. Progress is another term integral to this paper. It is also examined in more depth later but the essential meaning is 'movement toward a desired objective or circumstance'.

Tracking measures, as opposed to performance indicators, are intentionally used as the monitoring mechanism for internationalization. Tracking measures focus more on the process and the degree of progress and quality. Performance indicators are often seen to measure outputs and are more results-based.

### 1.2.2 Relationship between quality and internationalization

When one examines the relationship between quality and internationalization there are two fundamental issues (Knight

and de Wit, 1999a). What is the added value or qualitative difference that internationalization contributes to higher education? This is an outcome or results oriented approach. The second issue is more relevant to the institutional level and focuses on the quality of the individual and overall internationalization strategies. In other words, what is the quality of the internationalization initiatives that are undertaken from more of a process perspective? In this paper, the second question is addressed.

The quality assurance and assessment literature on internationalization (Smith, 1994; de Winter, 1996, Knight and de Wit, 1999a) refers to different approaches to this topic. The first approach focuses on the integration of the international dimension into the regular, ongoing quality assessment and assurance systems of institutional reviews, including program/discipline audits. The second approach involves the development of a special quality review system or instrument to assess internationalization policies, programs and initiatives (Knight and de Wit, 1999a; Van der Wende, 1999). Instruments such as the IQRP (Internationalization Quality Review Process) and the GATE (Global Alliance for Transnational Education) certification system and Codes of Practice are examples of the second approach. The internationalization tracking measures proposed in this paper could be applied to both approaches.

## 1.3 Outline

Section 2 looks at meaning of progress, quality and quality evaluation. Section 3 focuses on why quality is such a hot topic in the higher education sector in general and internationalization in particular. Section 4 introduces the concept of tracking measures for internationalization. The principles behind the development of the tracking measures are discussed. A generic tracking measures chart is presented as a conceptual framework followed by an example of a completed chart. Nine categories of suggested tracking measures are described and sample tracking measures are given for each grouping. Finally Section 5 presents and briefly describes several of the existing quality evaluation instruments which are being used to assess the quality of internationalization efforts.

## 2.0 QUALITY AND PROGRESS - WHAT DO WE MEAN?

It is important to have clarity on the meaning and definitions assigned to the key concepts being used to monitor and evaluate internationalization initiatives. Two concepts which form the foundation of this paper are 'quality' and 'progress'. The different terms used to describe the evaluation of quality are also examined.

### 2.1 Quality

Quality is a much used and misused term in the field of higher education. It is a complex concept because it is often "in the eye of the beholder" and we know that there are many and diverse beholders/stakeholders in the education sector. Some interpret quality in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and equity. Others describe quality in terms of perfection and excellence. And still

other stakeholders see quality as value for money. All can be correct if their basic assumptions are made clear.

Quality is a multidimensional concept and is grounded in values, cultures and traditions of individuals, institutions and countries. Therefore, it is essential that we are clear as to the meaning we assign to the term.

**Quality evaluation can be described as any process leading to judgements and/or recommendations regarding the quality of a unit, activity, or strategy.**

Harvey and Green (1993) attempted to develop a taxonomy of terms for the concept of quality. The primary categories they developed are as follows:

Quality as 'excellence'. This a traditional understanding of quality which involves trying to do the best job possible. This interpretation is used very often in higher education.

Quality as 'zero errors'. This interpretation centres on striving to be perfect. A 'zero errors' approach is more appropriate for the manufacturing industry than the education sector where it is hard to define let alone achieve perfection.

Quality as 'transformation'. This view rests on the belief that development and evolution is the basis of quality. The focus is often on the development and empowering of students.

Quality as 'threshold'. Quality is defined as a set of standards or norms or criteria which need to be met. The advantage of this approach is that the threshold or standard is objective and consistent. However, it has a sense static to it once the quality threshold has been achieved. The notion of standards is often used in certification or accreditation processes which are well-known in the education sector.

Quality as 'enhancement'. Continuous improvement is the backbone of this approach to defining quality. This approach is the mirror image of the 'threshold' approach. While the advantages include dynamic and constant improvement, it is often challenging to obtain an objective measure.

Quality as 'fitness for purpose'. This interpretation is guided by the belief that it is difficult, if not impossible, to define quality in general and that therefore quality needs to be seen as appropriateness for a specific purpose. If this is the case, the purpose needs to be clearly described or defined in terms of objectives or mission and quality can be demonstrated by achieving the objectives. This definition is frequently used in the higher education sector.

In this paper quality is used in the context of trying to do the best job possible (excellence) and continuous improvement (enhancement) to help meet stated objectives. Quality as 'fitness for purpose' is also a defining feature but is captured and directly linked with the concept of progress which is the second key concept.

## 2.2 Progress

Unlike quality, progress is a rather straightforward concept. The essence of progress is 'movement toward a desired objective or circumstance'. The key element in this definition is the

objective or circumstance. All too often, the objective is implied or not stated very clearly, so that it is difficult to assess it with either a qualitative or quantitative measure. It is assumed that the 'desired objectives' are appropriate for the institution's overall mission. Progress, as already mentioned, is closely linked to the 'fitness for purpose' definition of quality which stresses appropriateness for a specific objective.

## 2.3 Evaluation of quality

Quality evaluation can be described as any process leading to judgements and/or recommendations regarding the quality of a unit, activity, or strategy. There are different generic terms used to differentiate between various approaches to quality evaluation. According to Woodhouse (1996) there are four different generic approaches. They are: general accreditation, specialized or professional accreditation, audit or review, and quality assessment.

Accreditation is an evaluation of whether an institution qualifies for a certain status. Accreditation asks are you 'good' enough to be approved where approval implies admission to some category? Assessment is usually an evaluation that results in a grade whether it be numeric or descriptive. Assessment asks "how good are your outputs?" An audit (or review) is a check on an institution's explicit or implicit claims about itself. A review or audit asks "are your processes effective in achieving your objectives?"

Fundamentally, the difference between an assessment and accreditation is that the former asks how good are you and the latter asks are you good enough? An audit or review asks how good are you at achieving your stated objectives. The tracking measures are conceived as a review tool as they focus on the quality and progress towards achieving explicit objectives.

"Quality assurance" refers to the policies, attitudes, actions and procedures necessary to ensure that quality is being maintained and enhanced. It can involve different approaches which are collectively and generically referred to as quality assurance (Woodhouse, 1999).

**Accreditation is an evaluation of whether an institution qualifies for a certain status. Accreditation asks are you 'good' enough to be approved where approval implies admission to some category?**

## 3.0 WHY IS QUALITY IMPORTANT?

### 3.1 Importance in higher education sector

On the international front, the establishment of new quality assurance agencies and boards in many countries is one sign of the increased attention being given to quality (Brennan, 1997). The establishment of the International Quality Network of Quality Assurance Agencies, which has a membership of more than 60 such agencies, is an indication of this growing interest. Canada is not showing the same degree of preoccupation with quality that Europe, Australia, Hong Kong and other countries are. Education being under provincial jurisdiction is perhaps one reason that there is not a large groundswell of interest; however, there are signs that quality is becoming more important. The use of quality measures in terms of performance



indicators is becoming more prevalent in several provinces (Smith, 2000). Of course, accreditation systems for certain professional or graduate degrees have existed for a long time and are considered as quality assurance procedures.

There are a number of reasons why quality assessment and assurance is more of a priority in many countries (El-Khawass et al 1998, QAA, 1998; Schofield, 1999). There is both a rapid expansion and a pervasive rationalization of higher education systems. Some determination of quality is necessary to guide these developments. The increasing influence of the market approach to higher education is another catalyst influencing both the growth and down sizing of higher education systems. The increased emphasis on accountability for public sector funding in general and for education in particular is another major reason. This is intensified by the changing role of government in education resulting in decreased support from the government sources. All this is contributing to more and more preoccupation with quality and quality assessment. In this context, quality assessment is usually seen in terms of greater accountability by the institutions to their various stakeholders.

The higher education sector in Canada, and around the world, is also being impacted by new challenges, trends and issues (CMEC, 1999). These include privatization, decreased government funding, new teaching/learning/research technologies, globalization, knowledge-based economy, increased competition and new forms of collaboration. To respond proactively to these influences, quality assessment and assurance have been identified as means to help improve an institution's or program's relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. Another reason is the growing emphasis on "outcomes-based" approach to education which leads to an increased interest in performance indicators. Tied to this trend, is the consumerist movement where the student as client/customer is shopping around for the best value for the money. Indicators of quality (perceived or real) are important in this scenario as well.

### 3.2 Importance to internationalization

These trends and issues relate to higher education in general, but they are also pertinent to internationalization (Knight, 1999c). Along with increased importance, commitment and investment in internationalization, there are increased expectations as to the quality of the endeavors and the added value to higher education.

As a result of the increasing numbers of students who are traveling to other countries to undertake full degrees or even a semester of study, there is more interest in having indicators to

assure prospective students of the quality and equality of degrees. The same situation applies to the growing number of full degree or certificate programs which are being exported to foreign countries. There is real concern on the part of the receiving countries that they are getting the same academic quality as the same programs offered at home institutions. Countries such as Hong Kong are establishing quality control systems for imported programs. On the other hand, exporting countries such as the United Kingdom are implementing quality assessment procedures for many of

their exported programs. The GATE certification process is yet another example of a quality assessment and assurance operation for any transnational education program. Individual institutions, such as Monash University in Australia, are also developing comprehensive quality assurance systems for their offshore programs (McBurnie and Pollock, 2000).

There seems to be a myth accompanying the great leap forward in internationalization of colleges and universities. There is a perception that the more international a university is, the better it is and the higher quality its programs are. Of course, we want to believe and ensure that the international dimension of teaching/learning, research and service is enhancing the quality of education, but do we have a way to prove it. At this point in time, colleges and universities are becoming increasingly competitive for both the domestic and international market of students. The international dimension (or the IQ – International Quotient – however it may be measured) is being used as a strong marketing feature.

The recent study by AUCC (Knight, 2000) on the status of internationalization at Canadian universities showed that, in most cases, institutions were not gathering information systematically or consistently, and furthermore, evaluations of the internationalization efforts were not being undertaken. As internationalization comes of age, more questions will be asked about the quality of its strategies and the results or benefits accrued. These are fair and important questions. We need to plan for and address these concerns. Different kinds of approaches and measures are required. The proposed tracking measures are but one tool to help us collect and analyze the information necessary for evaluating internationalization.

Finally, the direct experience of developing, testing and revising the Internationalization Quality Review Process (Knight and de Wit, 1999) has led to the realization that institutions need a way to monitor internationalization and collect information on an ongoing basis. Institutions often spend too much time describing in very vague terms the status of internationalization. More precise, relevant measures of explicit objectives and targets will help to provide the necessary information to analyze strengths and areas of improvements. The proposed tracking measures are designed to help with this. With the information collected from the tracking measures, institutions can proceed to the more important step of analyzing how to maintain areas of strength, improve areas of weakness and ensure that internationalization goals and objectives are being met. This is in turn a precursor to analyzing the results and outcomes of internationalization endeavors.

**Institutions often spend too much time describing in very vague terms the status of internationalization. More precise, relevant measures of explicit objectives and targets will help to provide the necessary information to analyze strengths and areas of improvements.**

## 4.0 TRACKING MEASURES TO MONITOR INTERNATIONALIZATION

### 4.1 Tracking measures in general

The term tracking measure, as opposed to performance measure or indicator, has been consciously used in this paper to convey

**There seems to be a myth accompanying the great leap forward in internationalization of colleges and universities. There is a perception that the more international a university is, the better it is and the higher quality its programs are.**



an emphasis on progress, rather than on output. Tracking measures use quantitative data captured by numbers, ratios or yes/no responses as well as qualitative information expressed as opinions and judgements. According to Einstein, "Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted." This supports the importance of using both quantitative and qualitative measures. Furthermore, the two types of measures are usually stronger when used together.

Tracking measures can be described as 'monitors of the pulse'. They can provide a single snapshot of what is happening at a given moment in time. Or if used on a longitudinal basis, they can signal shifts in trends, either positive or negative.

When used over a period time, the positive trends will focus on how to preserve what is being done right and negative trends

will highlight opportunities for improvement. The movement of tracking measures over time is likely to be more significant and useful than their comparative value at any one time.

Appropriate tracking measures need to be relevant, clear, reliable, consistent over time, accessible and easy to use. Institutions need to be

vigilant in the choice of tracking measures they make. They need to be pertinent to the desired objective. There should not be too many tracking measures as more effort will be spent on collecting the information than on analyzing it. Finally they need to stand the test of time as they should be used over a period to get a true picture of progress toward reaching the objective and whether there is an improvement in the quality.

**The movement of tracking measures over time is likely to be more significant and useful than their comparative value at any one time.**

## 4.2 Guiding principles

An Internationalization Tracking Measure is defined as 'a measure which tracks the progress and quality of an internationalization element or strategy toward achieving a desired objective or target'. Several key principles have guided the development of internationalization tracking measures. They are as follows:

1. The internationalization tracking measures are focused on two aspects - progress and quality. Progress is measured by a quantitative and/or qualitative measure and assesses movement toward achieving objectives and targets. Quality is measured by an opinion or judgement of those doing the assessment. It is a qualitative judgement of the level of excellence achieved and improvement needed.
2. The proposed tracking measures are based on the assumption that one way progress and quality of internationalization efforts can be measured is according to the objectives and targets set by the institution. One of the key challenges involved is that the objectives and targets have been more implicit than explicit. It is impossible to know whether you have reached your goal or have done it well if it has not been clearly defined or stated.

3. The tracking measures relate to both organizational strategies (i.e. policies, procedures and structures) and program strategies (i.e. student and faculty mobility, curriculum, research, institutional agreements, international students). This principle assumes that if an international/intercultural dimension is to be integrated and sustained then both activities and policies/structures need to be addressed and evaluated.
4. The tracking measures are more oriented to evaluating the process of internationalization than the outcomes or impacts. For instance, they do not attempt to measure the degree to which internationalization efforts have increased the knowledge or skills of the graduates or their employability. They do attempt to measure how well the institution has met its objective to internationalize the academic experience (through curriculum, teaching learning process, study abroad initiatives) so that students will gain a deeper understanding of international issues and increased intercultural skills.
5. Internationalization tracking measures point out where improvement is desirable and necessary. They do not provide explicit directions on how to improve.
6. There is no "ideal" or "optimal" measurement profile of an internationalized higher education institution. The tracking measures are not intended to be used to achieve a quality standard of what an internationalized institution would look like.
7. The adage that the "whole is greater than the sum of its parts" applies to the use of the tracking measures. Tracking each element or strategy has merit but how the different elements work together in an integrated and strategic manner is equally important and therefore the relationships between and among tracking measures needs to be analyzed.
8. Tracking measures fit into the Review Phase of the Internationalization Cycle. Therefore, to gain full benefit from them they need to be used on a regular basis and over a period of time so that they can inform the ongoing planning, implementation and reinforcement of the internationalization plan.

## 4.3 Internationalization tracking measure chart

A generic chart has been designed to introduce the use of tracking measures. When used appropriately, it can signal where there are problems to be addressed. The chart ensures that objectives and targets are explicitly stated and the level of achievement measured. The purpose of the tracking measure chart is to collect information which can be used to analyze what kind of improvements are necessary, desirable and feasible. Why improvement is required or what kind of improvements are most appropriate are not captured in the chart. The conceptual framework is introduced in the following chart, and then elaborated on in the next section.

## Internationalization Tracking Measure Chart

Time Period: Date to Date											
Elements	Tracking Measure	Objective or Target  Quantitative or Qualitative	Progress  Quantitative Measure  Actual Number or Yes/No	Progress  Qualitative Measure  Degree of Progress				Quality  Qualitative Measure  Level of Quality			
				0	1	2	3	A	B	C	D
Column One	Column Two	Column Three	Column Four	Column Five				Column Six			
Elements refer to the major components or strategies of an institution's overall plan for internationalization. They can be organizational strategies (policies, structures, resources) or program strategies (i.e. international agreements, curriculum, student mobility).	A tracking measure is the tool used to assess a particular aspect of the element or strategy.	A clearly stated objective or target is a prerequisite to assessing progress and quality.  The objective or target can be expressed in narrative or numerical terms.	This column provides the current level of achievement either in numerical terms or in a few cases with a yes/no response.	A judgement on the level of progress is stated in this column.  This is critical to identifying areas where improvement is required.				The level of excellence or amount of improvement needed to fully achieve the stated objective or target is included in this column.  It signals where strengths need to be maintained or where improvements are required.			
Legend	Progress:    0 - none            1 - low            2 - medium            3 - high Quality:     A - Needs significant improvement    B - Needs some improvement    C - Adequate            D - Excellent										

### 4.4 Explanation of the chart

The following section explains the thinking behind the purpose and use for each column. This information will help the user better understand the intent of the chart and help in the use and adaptation of the charts.

#### Time Period

It is extremely important to determine a realistic time period between the setting of objectives/targets and their eventual evaluation. The tracking measures can be updated on a frequent basis which allows for ongoing monitoring of the progress and quality. The determination and evaluation of the significance of the measures at the end of the period is essential for setting priorities and planning the next cycle.

#### Element/Strategy

##### Column One

A comprehensive internationalization plan consists of different elements or strategies. Each institution will give different levels of importance to individual strategies. Elements and strategies are terms which used can be used interchangeably. They refer to

the organizational strategies (e.g. policies, structures, resources) and to program areas (e.g. curriculum, research, projects). It is important to distinguish between the institution-wide comprehensive plan/strategy and the individual elements/strategies that make up the plan. In this column, the individual elements/strategies are the focus.

#### Tracking Measure

##### Column Two

The tracking measure is designed to monitor and measure a particular aspect of the internationalization element. It is imperative that the tracking measures assess the presence and functioning of policies, procedures as well as programs. The ones listed in Section 5 are considered to be important individually and collectively. Some may not be particularly relevant to an institution's articulated priorities and in this case should be eliminated. In other cases, institutions may want to add measures that are particularly relevant to their plan.

#### Objective/Target - Quantitative or qualitative response

##### Column Three

Quality and progress are more effectively measured if there is an



explicit objective or target stated. In too many instances, goals and objectives are implicit and vague. It is therefore important to state clearly whether the specific aspect described by the measure is 1) a priority for the institution and 2) has been articulated in terms of a measurable objective or target.

The user will find that there are several measures which are purposely not defined in numerical terms. In these instances, it is more likely that the user will answer with a yes or no response or an indication whether this is a priority for the

institution or not. This column is more important for those measures requiring a numerical response and is directly linked to column four.

### Progress - Quantitative Measure

#### Column Four

The purpose of this column is to present and compare the actual numbers (ratios, percentages, etc.) as compared to the target numbers identified in the previous column. The differences

### Sample Chart

<b>INSTITUTIONAL ACADEMIC AGREEMENTS AND COOPERATION</b> Time Period: September 1999 – September 2000											
Elements	Tracking Measure	Objective or Target Quantitative or Qualitative	Progress Quantitative Measure Actual Number	Progress Qualitative Measure Degree of Progress				Quality Qualitative Measure Level of Quality			
				0	1	2	3	A	B	C	D
Column One	Column Two	Column Three	Column Four	Column Five				Column Six			
<b>Institutional Academic Agreements and Cooperation</b> Includes bilateral or multi-lateral relationships Types of activities include: student and faculty exchange, joint research projects, curriculum design and delivery	Percentage of departments with international agreements	60%	40%		X			X			
	Total number of international academic agreements	45	38			X				X	
	Number of international academic agreements active during the past 2 years.	25	18		X			X			
	Number of agreements which are multi-dimensional	30 (out of 45)	15	X				X			
	A strategic approach and set of criteria used for selection of countries and partners	to be developed by June 2000	Completed				X			X	
	Internal evaluation system assesses agreements on a regular basis	to be revised by Sept 2000					X				X
	Desired geographic balance is achieved	high priority		X				X			
	Desired developing/developed country balance is achieved	low priority			X				X		
	Desired discipline balance is achieved	medium priority				X				X	
Legend	<b>Progress:</b> 0 - none            1 - low            2 - medium            3 - high <b>Quality:</b> A - Needs significant improvement    B - Needs some improvement    C - Adequate            D - Excellent										

between target (column three) and actual numbers (column four) will show the degree of progress being made to achieve the objective.

### **Progress - Qualitative Measure - Degree of Progress**

#### **Column Five**

It is important to note the perceived degree of progress being made to achieve the objective. Numbers do not tell the whole story. The intent of this column is to have the user reflect on what degree of progress is really being made and why. The use of the information is to determine ways and means of either maintaining the high degree of progress or improving where there is a low level.

### **Quality - Qualitative Measure - Level of Quality**

#### **Column Six**

In essence, this column addresses the level of excellence achieved and the amount of improvement needed. The rating scale (A=significant improvement needed, B=some improvement needed, C=adequate and D=excellent) helps the user to subjectively assess the quality. This is descriptive information only and will not be of any use to institutions unless the next step of analysis is taken. Action to either maintain excellence or implement the necessary improvements needs to be identified, agreed upon, supported, implemented and then evaluated. Tracking must be iterative to be of value.

## **4.5 Suggested tracking measures**

A set of draft tracking measures are presented below on nine major internationalization elements or strategies. These can be considered as examples. Institutions should customize the measures to make sure that they are relevant and useful to their particular programs and priorities. An important aspect to remember is that they should be clear, easily measured and valid over time.

### **1. Planning and Review**

International dimension is acknowledged in institutional mission statement

Rationale, goals and benefits of internationalization are clearly articulated in institutional policy or planning documents

A comprehensive internationalization strategic/long-term plan supported by annual operational plans are in place

A direct link exists between the internationalization strategic plan and the institution's overall long-term plan

Country-specific plans to coordinate diverse international activities in priority countries are in place

Review and evaluation mechanisms for internationalization program and organization strategies are operational

Specific improvement plans are developed and implemented after evaluations are completed

### **2. Faculty/Staff involvement and development**

#### **Involvement**

Number of faculty/staff participating in international institutional exchange agreements

Number of faculty/staff participating in overseas research, development or training projects

Number of visiting international faculty/staff collaborating with domestic personnel

Number of departments with faculty/staff directly involved and supported in international activities

#### **Development**

Number of faculty/staff receiving external grants/support for international academic activities

Number of faculty/staff receiving internal grants/support for international academic activities

Professional development workshops available on regular basis to support involvement in overseas projects - teaching, training, consulting, benchmarking, etc.

#### **Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, Recognition**

Hiring policies and practices include criteria for international expertise where relevant

Promotion and tenure policies and practices include criteria for international achievements

Explicit recognition given to faculty/staff for leadership, innovation or excellence in internationalization pursuits

### **3. Institutional Academic Agreements and Cooperation**

Percentage of departments with active international agreements

Total number of international academic agreements

Number of international academic agreements active during the past year

Number of multi-dimensional agreements

Strategic approach and set of criteria used for selection of partners and countries

An evaluation system assesses agreements on a regular basis

Desired geographic balance is achieved

Desired developing/developed country balance is achieved

Desired discipline balance is achieved

### **4. Academic Experiences Abroad for Students Advisory and Support Services**

Available study abroad opportunities are widely promoted to all students

Counseling services are provided for outgoing and incoming students

Pre-departure preparation is provided for all outgoing students

Re-entry debriefing and support is available for all returning students



Appropriate safety and legal processes are in place for study abroad students

Workshops are provided for faculty on integrating study abroad experiences into curriculum

Cross-cultural communication workshops are provided for students and faculty/staff members

#### Student exchange programs

Number of active student exchange agreements

Total number of outgoing students per year

Undergraduate

Graduate

Percentage of total student enrolment represented by outgoing undergraduate/graduate students

Number of incoming exchange students per year

Undergraduate

Graduate

Number of different departments sending or receiving students on exchange

#### Internships or placements, field trips, project work abroad

Number of different schools/departments offering opportunities

Number of different courses providing international field trips

Total number of students participating in internships, field trips, project work

Strong link with curriculum, teaching/learning and research

### **5. International Students on Home Campus**

#### Advisory and support services

Trained academic and social/cultural advisor/s available, including admission officers aware of and able to assess international credentials fairly

Orientation and re-entry programs provided

Social/cultural/peer programs are provided for international and domestic students

Counseling on visa, health, employment issues available

Academic monitoring and support services provided

Links provided to local community services and activities

Emergency assistance plan in place

#### Number of International Students on Campus

Total number of full-time international fee-paying students on campus

Percentage of total student enrolment

Percentage of departments with international students enrolled

Geographic and cultural balance is achieved

### **6. Curriculum and Teaching/Learning Process**

#### Integrating an international/intercultural perspective into appropriate course work

Review process in place to identify and monitor the integration of international, comparative, global or intercultural perspective or issues

Workshops and funding offered to provide faculty assistance in internationalizing curriculum

Regularly involve international scholars, visiting experts and local international/multicultural groups in course work

Integrate international students and returned study abroad students as resource in the classroom

Use communication technology for students to do joint assignments with students in other countries

Strong link between development projects, international field research and curriculum

#### Foreign Language Study

Number of foreign languages taught at undergraduate level

Percentage of undergraduate students taking foreign language studies as a major or minor

#### International Programs

Number of undergraduate and graduate level programs specifically designed with international content or sojourn

Balance across disciplines is achieved

Number of joint or double degrees with international institutions

### **7. Research and Scholarly Activities**

Advisory services and funding support for faculty/staff to develop international research projects or links

Number of active international collaborative research agreements

Number of departments with formal research projects with international partners

Percentage of all externally funded research initiatives which involve international partners

### **8. International Projects: Offshore Training and Education Projects**

#### Development Assistance Projects

Number of operational international development projects

Desired distribution of projects across departments/centres

Academic contribution of project to curriculum and research activities

Number and distribution of faculty/staff and students involved in and benefitting from project

Strong link of projects to other internationalization activities

### Offshore Training and Academic Programs

Coordinating mechanism in place to monitor selection, implementation and evaluation of offshore academic programs

Training/briefing and recognition given to faculty/staff who teach in program

Strong link with other international activities in same country or region

## 9. Organizational Factors Structures

Designated office responsible for providing support, resources and monitoring of overall internationalization plan/strategy

Mechanism (committee, unit, position) to coordinate the different units and offices with direct operational responsibility for international initiatives

Central institutional services (library, student services, housing, etc.) actively supporting, where appropriate, internationalization plan and efforts

### Financing

Mechanism for allocation of resources to support internationalization at both central and local levels

Cost/revenue allocation system for fees/revenue from international activities

Sustainable funding base for core internationalization activities

International initiatives included in institution's external fundraising campaigns

## 4.6 Guidelines on using the tracking measures

The way in which the different elements are integrated and reinforce each other is critical to developing a successful and sustainable internationalization plan. Attempts have been made in the tracking measures to address the relationship and link between and among strategies. However, the format of separate lists for each strategy is not conducive to promoting a holistic and integrated approach. Users are encouraged to stress the relationship of one element to another during the self-assessment use of the tracking measures.

The tracking measures are not specifically designed for comparison between or among institutions in a benchmarking type of exercise. Some of the tracking measures can be interpreted in several different ways which would negate the value of a cross-institution comparison. However, they could be easily adapted for this purpose. If a group of institutions selected specific tracking measures pertinent to all of them, then tracking measures could be used in a benchmarking context.

Qualitative measures by definition are subjective. They are the opinions and judgements of those doing the assessment. Because of this, it may be prudent to avoid having only one

person undertake the evaluation and completion of the tracking measures.

The tracking measures can be used in the self-assessment phase of many quality assessment exercises. For instance, they could provide a systematic way for institutions to collect some of the necessary information for the Internationalization Quality Review Process (IQRP) or even the ISO 9000 exercise. They have been designed to be used as a 'stand alone' self-assessment procedure or as part of other quality assessment procedures.

Tracking measures are intended to be used as one part of an evaluation exercise for those institutions with an overall internationalization plan in place. However, institutions that are in the initial phase of developing a strategic plan for internationalization may find the concept of tracking measures useful.

## 5.0 QUALITY EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS<sup>1</sup>

This section identifies and briefly describes several quality assessment instruments which are being applied to the international dimension of higher education. These include: Codes of Practice, the GATE certification process, IQRP, ISO 9000 guidelines and Benchmarks.

### 5.1 Codes of practice

Codes of Practice are one of the more traditional approaches used to address quality assurance of specific international activities. They do not, however, address the progress dimension. For the most part, codes of practice are statements of principles and can be interpreted as moral imperatives in defined areas of internationalization. Codes of practice are very common at the national level.

For example, UKCOSA: Council for International Education, in conjunction with the British Council, educational institutions and professional organizations, were among the first organizations to develop a 'Code of Practice for educational institutions and overseas students'. The UKCOSA code is an example of the kind of approach used in the mid-eighties to ensure ethical and responsible recruitment practices and support services for international students studying in the United Kingdom.

As the size of the market for international students increased, codes of practice took on more importance and were often broadened in scope. The 'Code of Ethical Practice in International Education' developed by the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE, 1993) is a good example of this. It is interesting to note that the term "international education" is used in this code (not international students) and that it covers many different types of activities. The CBIE code is essentially a statement of principles which all members accept by virtue of their membership in CBIE. Protocols for the monitoring or enforcement of the code are not articulated.

The set of principles recently revised by the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee (AVCC, 1998) is an example of how codes evolve to respond to the changes in the provision of

<sup>1</sup> Portions of this section have been adapted from the chapter "Quality Assurance Instruments and their Relationship to IQRP" (Knight and de Wit, 1999a)



international education. The AVCC revised two of its existing codes of practice and has combined them into a new "Code of Ethical Practice in the Provision of Education to International Students by Australian Universities". The first part of the revised code contains 'Guidelines for Universities providing courses to International Students'. There are ten major points covered by these guidelines: promotion and marketing; agents and partners; admission; pre-arrival information for international students studying in Australia; arrival and orientation for international students studying in Australia; information for students; university infrastructure; student support and offshore students returning home. The second set of guidelines included in the code addresses the issue of fee refunds for international students.

While codes of practice have been developed and adopted by national organizations for many years, they remain a generic type of quality assurance instrument. In general, there is no regulatory system in place to assess compliance although NAESA: Association of International Educators does have a monitoring process in place. Instead such a code appeals to the ethics and conscience of the institutions and the staff who are involved in international student mobility programs and it tries to develop a set of values and principles to guide the process.

A more recent development in the field of quality assessment and assurance for one aspect of internationalization has been the creation of a new organization called GATE (Global Alliance for Transnational Education) which has developed a code of good practice and a certification process.

## 5.2 The Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE) certification process

Transnational education, as defined by GATE (1997) 'denotes any teaching or learning activity in which the learners are in a different country (the host country) to that in which the institution providing the education is based (the home country)'. This situation requires that national boundaries be crossed by information, staff and/or educational materials.

GATE has developed a set of 'Principles for Transnational Education' (1997) to guide the provision of transnational education. The principles serve as a code for good practice to which institutions should adhere when offering transnational education. They are summarized below. A process of certification has also been developed which is at the present time undergoing a significant re-assessment. At the time of writing it is uncertain as to whether GATE will continue the certification process in its present form. However, the principles are still relevant and sound.

1. ***Goals and Objectives:** Transnational courses must be guided by goals and objectives that are understood by participants who enrol in them and must fit appropriately within the provider's mission and expertise.*
2. ***Standards:** Students receiving education and education(al) credentials through transnational courses must be assured by the provider that these courses have been approved by the provider and meet its criteria for educational quality, and that the same standards are applied, regardless of the place or manner in which the courses are provided.*

3. ***Legal and Ethical Matters:** Transnational courses must comply with all appropriate laws and approvals of the host country.*
4. ***Student Enrolment and Admission:** Participants in transnational courses must be treated equitably and ethically. In particular, all pertinent information must be disclosed to the participants and each participant must hold full student status or its equivalent with the provider organization.*
5. ***Human Resources:** The provider organization must have a sufficient number of fully qualified people engaged in providing the transnational courses, and their activities must be supervised and regularly evaluated as a normal activity of the provider.*
6. ***Physical and Financial Resources:** The provider organization must assure an adequate learning environment and resources for the transnational courses, and must provide assurances that adequate resources will continue to be available until all obligations to enrolled participants are fulfilled.*
7. ***Teaching and Learning:** Transnational courses must be pedagogically sound with respect to the methods of teaching and the nature and needs of the learners.*
8. ***Student Support:** The provider organization must ensure that students are provided with adequate support services to maximize the potential benefit they receive from the transnational courses.*
9. ***Evaluation:** Transnational courses must be regularly and appropriately evaluated as a normal part of the provider organization's activities, with the results of the evaluations being used to improve these courses.*
10. ***Third Parties:** Where third parties such as agents or collaborating institutions are involved, there must be explicit written agreements covering their roles, expectations and obligations.*

## 5.3 Internationalization Quality Review Process (IQRP)

The Internationalization Quality Review Process (Knight and de Wit, 1999a) is a process whereby individual institutions of higher education assess and enhance the quality of their international dimension according to their own stated aims and objectives. The review process includes procedures, guidelines and tools to be adapted and used in both a self-assessment exercise and an external peer review. The purpose of IQRP is to assist institutions to improve their internationalization work; it is not a certification or accreditation process.

The IQRP is developed by the Programme on Institutional Management of Higher Education (IMHE) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in consultation with the Academic Co-operation Association (ACA). As of July 2000 the above organizations are cooperating with the Association of European Universities (CRE) to formally offer International Quality Reviews to higher education institutions in Europe and around the world. This is a professional fee-based review service but it is not a certification or accreditation process. It is intended to help institutions assess and improve their internationalization strategies.

The starting point for the IQRP is the institution's stated aims and objectives. The review process assesses the extent to which institutions actually achieve the aims and objectives which they set for themselves. The assessment of the relationship between objectives and actual achievement focuses on the core of the quality issue.

The review consists of two parts: self-assessment and peer review. The purpose of self-assessment is to provide a critical self-evaluation of a variety of aspects related to the quality of the internationalization efforts of an institution. The more emphasis given to self-assessment, the more self-assessment will function as a means of training and assisting the institution to take responsibility for its own quality improvement. The purpose of external peer review is to hold up a mirror on the self-assessment process and to provide feedback and a complementary analysis to that done by the institution but from a different, external and international perspective. The emphasis is not on actual fact-finding, inspection or evaluation.

The IQRP is not intended to prescribe practices or advocate uniformity or standardization of internationalization approaches or procedures. There is no explicit or implicit comparison with other institutions involved. It is a self-assessment exercise for self-improvement of an individual institution.

While the IQRP is guided by the institution's own goals and objectives for internationalization, there are major areas of internationalization activity, policy and practice which are common to many institutions and which the review process attempts to address.

The emphasis of the self-assessment exercise is on the analysis of the quality of the internationalization strategies and dimensions of the institution, not merely a description of the various internationalization initiatives.

A Self-Assessment Team (SAT) is formed at the institutional level and is mandated to 1) collect the necessary information, 2) undertake a critical analysis of the provision for, quality of and contribution of internationalization, and 3) prepare the self-assessment report based on the Self-Assessment Framework. The Self-Assessment Framework is intended to serve as a guide for the process of analyzing the aims and objectives, performance and achievements, strengths and weaknesses, and opportunities and threats in developing the international dimension of an institution.

The purpose of the self-assessment is to analyze the international dimension not to merely describe it. While collecting data to build a profile of all the different activities, programs, policies and procedures related to the internationalization of the institution is important, this is only the first step. The analysis of an institution's performance and achievements according to their articulated aims and objectives for internationalization is critical to assessing and eventually assuring the quality of the international dimension and the contribution it can make to higher education.

The framework is organized into the major parts which are listed below:

1. Summary of the higher education system
2. Summary of the institutional profile
3. Analysis of the (inter)national context
4. Policies and strategies
5. Organization and support services
6. Academic programs

7. Research and scholarly collaboration
8. Students
9. Faculty and Staff
10. External Relations and Services
11. Conclusions

The task of the Peer Review Team is to determine: 1) what are the goals for internationalization of the institution and whether they are clearly formulated; 2) how are the goals translated into the institution's curriculum, research and public service functions and how is the institution providing the necessary support and infrastructure for successful internationalization; 3) how the institution knows that its internationalization works (how it monitors its efforts); 4) how the university or college changes in order to improve its internationalization strategies.

The IQRP guidelines and framework are designed in such a way that they are applicable to a great variety of circumstances. They can be used by small and large institutions, comprehensive or specialized institutions, private or public institutions, in developed or developing countries. The guidelines are flexible enough so that IQRP can be used by institutions wishing to assess a well-developed institutional plan or those in the process of developing a strategy. Therefore, while the review process is intended to be international in application, acknowledgment and recognition of differences among institutions and countries is essential.

## 5.4 ISO standards

ISO 9000 is a generic term for the ISO family of standards and guidelines relating to quality assurance of management systems. In short, the standards specify requirements for what the organization should do to manage processes which influence quality.

The ISO group of standards originated in the manufacturing industry. The relevance to the education sector is seen to be growing as increasingly education is being seen as a service industry. The current emphasis on the quality of education services is leading governments to demand that colleges and universities publicly demonstrate their quality. As a result institutions are searching for concrete and coherent quality assurance systems which provide evidence in ways acceptable to an external audit process. The ISO 9000 family of standards has thus entered the education sector as one of these standardized external audit procedures. ISO 9000 standards are seen as a reliable means of providing quality assurance over the broad range of institutional processes and in some cases the design of the educational product itself. ISO is not a certifying authority. It publishes agreed standards but does not certify the outcome.

In an education setting, some of the management processes amenable to ISO 9002 application include student admissions, staff selection and development, strategic planning, teaching and learning, research and project administration, international activities, financial planning and accounting. At the most basic and fundamental level, ISO is concerned with the documentation of management systems and the compliance with those systems.

Quality assurance processes provide a means of demonstrating the institution's commitment to its clients both domestic and international. As a way to illustrate how ISO standards are equally important and appropriate for international initiatives,



several key areas of internationalization activities which lend themselves to an ISO 9000 review are listed below. In each category, examples of the management processes which could be documented and then monitored for quality compliance are given (Adams, 1998).

#### **Development of appropriate missions, strategies and values:**

- relationship of internationalization strategy to institutional strategy, mission and values
- explicit articulation of rationale, goals and objectives for internationalization
- policy statements to enable and monitor internationalization activities
- relationship of international initiatives and programs to the international strategy

#### **Provision for international experience as part of academic course credit for 10% of students:**

- promotion and access to study abroad opportunities
- academic, cultural, logistical support for incoming/outgoing students
- student satisfaction
- cross-cultural briefing and support
- articulation arrangements
- relationship to internationalization of the curriculum
- program evaluation

#### **Development of offshore degree programs:**

This includes a range of delivery modes and direct teaching that provide opportunities for students to study and obtain a foreign degree completely or partially in their own country.

- contract development and maintenance
- selection of partners and representatives
- student admission standards compared to degree-granting country
- processes for transfer of offshore students to degree granting country
- relationship of courses taught transnationally with domestic courses
- in-country cultural and ethical standards
- in-country, regulatory and tax advice
- marketing, recruiting and admissions
- student support

#### **Recruitment of international fee-paying students:**

- marketing and recruiting strategy for international students
- publications strategy
- international student admissions
- international student support
- cross-cultural teaching and learning strategies
- cross-cultural training for teaching and administrative staff
- English language standards of entry and support
- acceptance of overseas qualifications for entry and advanced standing
- relationship between domestic and international standards of entry
- selection and support of recruiting agents
- international student performance and graduation rate

#### **Explicit and implicit internationalization of the curriculum:**

- cross-cultural teaching and support
- staff development
- relationship to student and staff mobility
- resources available for project development
- international internship and cooperative education openings for students
- external funding performance
- use of best international professional practice case studies
- relationship of language teaching to student and staff mobility

In summary, ISO 9002 attempts to provide a coherent means of assuring the quality of international education by requiring a strategic framework and processes for detailed implementation and auditing of these strategies. Where appropriate, ISO 9001 can go one step further and address the actual design of the product, or in other words assess and ensure the quality of the design of education or training programs.

### **5.5 Performance indicators**

As already discussed, demands for accountability from external bodies plus the ongoing quest for improvement, have lead to a growing preoccupation with performance indicators for the higher education sector.

Several definitions of 'performance indicators' are found in the literature. One well-known definition describes performance indicators as "ratios, percentages, or other quantitative values that allow an institution to compare its position in key strategic areas to peers, to past performance or to previously set goals" (Taylor et al. 1993). This is similar, but at the same time slightly different from the definition suggested by AUCC (1995): "A performance indicator is a policy relevant statistic, number or qualitative description that provides a measure of whether the university, some aspect of it, or the university system is performing as it should. Performance indicators have a comparative dimension or a reference point that permits a value judgement to be made about the institution or system. The comparison or reference point may be a goal or an objective, an absolute standard, a past value (comparison over time) or a comparison across institutions, regions or countries." The second definition includes absolute standards and qualitative measures while the first one does not. This is a point of debate as there are serious questions whether quantitative/numerical measurements can truly assess the complexity of the issues being measured and furthermore who is setting or determining the standards.

There is a tendency to refer to all indicators as performance indicators. There are some measures which are expressions of performance in the sense that they have a fixed point of reference that operates as a norm or standard. The key question is whether the standard is selected or imposed, and if it is institution-specific or system-wide. This is the source of much debate and some dissatisfaction with the use and misuse of performance indicators. Generally, performance indicators are a category of management indicators. They are often indicators of output.

Recent discussion has focused on a few key questions: How effectively can quantitative performance indicators capture the

quality of the educational experience and the value of research outcomes? Is it possible to define valid sector-wide indicators given the diversity in institutional profiles? How will the indicators be used? Will they inform funding decisions? How much work will be involved in their collection? There is growing awareness and agreement, however, that while performance indicators do not provide a substitute for qualitative judgement, when used and interpreted appropriately, they can provide some measure of "organizational health".

The fact that indicators are prevalent does not mean that there is a consensus about them. Nor is there a consensus about how indicators should be used or what questions they should inform. Despite various attempts to generalize about quality, in the end indicators operate best at the program level within individual institutions. It has been suggested that the higher the level of their aggregation, the less useful quality indicators become.

## 5.6 Benchmarking

Benchmarking is a quality management tool and is yet another term with a myriad of definitions. Key themes include measurement, comparison, identification of best practices, and improvement. A collective definition of benchmarking could refer to 'analysis of process, activities, performances compared within or between organizations'. The objectives of this comparison exercise is to assess an institution's standards, obtaining information for self-improvement and implementing changes to affect improvement.

A recent study in Australia (McKinnon et al, 1999) focused on developing key benchmarks for inter-university and in some cases intra-university comparison. The study included both criterion-based and quantitative benchmarks. Internationalization was among the nine different themes included in the study. For the internationalization theme, seven different benchmarks were developed and piloted. They include the following: 1) Internationalization Strategy 2) Culture of Internationalization 3) Balanced Onshore International Student Program 4) Financing Internationalization 5) Students' Exposure to International Experience 6) Management of Offshore Delivery and 7) Overseas Institutional Activity. It is interesting but not surprising that there is considerable overlap between these seven benchmark areas and the key elements of internationalization referred to in this paper.

The two approaches to benchmarking used in the McKinnon study are very different but complementary. The 'criterion reference' approach simply defines the attributes of good practice in a specific area. For example, one aspect of good practice for internationalization in the area of students' exposure to international experience both directly and indirectly through staff. It is described as follows: "25% of academic staff will have had recent research, teaching or practice supervision experience, with a duration of more than four weeks, in an overseas country within the last three years, 25% of home campus students will have had substantial interaction (in excess of five hours of contact) with international visiting academics."

The second approach, 'quantitative benchmarks' are used to measure normative and competitive levels of achievement. An internationalization example is 'the percent of the undergraduate cohort studying abroad'. This study is an important step forward and it will be interesting to see whether institu-

tions decide to use these internationalization benchmarks and for what purposes.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

At this stage in the maturation of internationalization the importance of monitoring the progress and quality of our internationalization efforts needs to be emphasized. We need to assure ourselves and the different stakeholder groups that the process of internationalization is being evaluated on a regular and consistent basis and secondly, that improvements are being made to ensure that the international dimension of teaching/learning, research and service is contributing to the relevance and quality of higher education.

This paper has examined the notions of quality and quality assessment as it relates to internationalization. The concept of internationalization tracking measures has been introduced as one approach institutions can consider to monitor and review their internationalization strategies. A framework and set of draft tracking measures have been put forward for discussion and testing. These measures are still a 'work in progress'. They need to be pilot tested, analyzed and refined. Institutions need to think about developing a series of tracking measures that are relevant and useful to their priorities and stage of development. Some of the proposed tracking measures will be more useful than others. Additional tracking measures will need to be developed. In short, the tracking measures are "not carved in stone". CBIE is interested in hearing from institutions who would like to introduce tracking measures into their planning and evaluation of internationalization strategies and who would like to share their experiences with others.

This paper examined several approaches assessing internationalization efforts. It is a positive sign to have a variety of different instruments available to institutions. The "one size fits all" philosophy does not acknowledge the individuality of higher education institutions. How do the proposed internationalization tracking measures relate to the various other instruments? They can be used in combination with other approaches or as a stand-alone instrument.

The quality and progress of the process of internationalization has been the deliberate focus of this paper. Improvement, as opposed to accountability, has been the underlying and driving principle, recognizing that these concepts are, of course, closely linked. Another fundamentally important aspect is the quality of impact/benefits of internationalization and international education initiatives. This is a major question and deserves our urgent attention. We as international educators are convinced of the importance and benefits of our work, but are we doing an adequate job of demonstrating to others that internationalization is adding value to higher education and that the interest and investment in internationalization is making a difference to the students we graduate, the research we undertake and the services we provide to the local and global communities? As we determine the agenda for future advocacy, education and research work at the sector level, the quality issue needs to be near the top. The same is true at the institutional level: monitoring the process and impact of internationalization is critical to the sustainability, credibility and value of internationalization's contribution to higher education.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, T. 1998. *ISO and the International Dimension of Higher Education*. Unpublished paper.
- AUCC. 1995. *A Primer on Performance Indicators*. Ottawa, Canada: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Research File Vol. 1. No 2.
- AVCC. 1998. *Code of Ethical Practice in the Provision of Education to International Students by Australian Universities*. Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee. Canberra, Australia.
- Back K., D. Davis and A. Olsen. 1996. *Internationalization of Higher Education: Goals and Strategies*. Canberra: IDP Education Australia.
- Bolton, S. 1997. *Marketing our Education to the World: A Report on the Changing International Perspectives of the College/CEGEP Community in Canada*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education, CBIE Research Series, No 10.
- Bond S. and J.P Lemasson. (Eds) 1999. *A New World of Knowledge: Canadian Universities and Globalization*. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre.
- Brennan J. 1997. "Authority, Legitimacy and Change: The Rise of Quality Assessment in Higher Education", in *Higher Education Management*. Vol 9, No. 1.
- CBIE. 1993. *Code of Ethical Practice in International Education*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- CBIE. 1998. *Canada: At a Crossroads for International Education in the New Millennium. A Working paper*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education and a coalition of six NGO's.
- CMEC. 1999. *A Report on Public Expectations of Postsecondary Education in Canada*. Toronto, Canada: Council of Ministers of Education, Canada.
- El-Khawas E., R. DePietro-Jurand and L. Holm-Nielsen. 1998. *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Recent progress; Challenges Ahead*. Washington, D.C., USA: World Bank.
- GATE. 1997. *Certification Manual*. Globalization Alliance for Transnational Education. Washington, D.C.
- Harvey L. and D. Green. 1993. "Defining Quality", in *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 18, No. 1.
- Haug, G. and J. Race. 1998. "Interregional cooperation in higher education in Europe" in the *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol 2, Number 2. pp 5-34.
- Hawkins, J. et al (Eds) 1998. *International Education in the New Global Era*. Los Angeles: International Studies and Overseas Programs, University of California.
- HEQC 1996. *Code of Practice for Overseas Collaborative Provision in Higher Education*. London. UK. Higher Education Quality Council.
- Knight, J. 2000. *Progress and Promise: The 2000 AUCC Report on Internationalization at Canadian Universities*. Ottawa, Canada: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Knight J. and H. de Wit (Eds). 1999a. *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education*. Paris, France OECD/IMHE.
- Knight, J. 1999b. *A Time of Turmoil and Transformation for Internationalization*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education, CBIE Research Paper No. 14.
- Knight J. 1999c. "Issues and Trends in Internationalization: A Comparative Perspective" in S. Bond and J.P Lemasson. (Eds) *A New World of Knowledge: Canadian Universities and Globalization*. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre.
- Knight, J. 1995. *Internationalization at Canadian Universities: The Changing Landscape*. Ottawa, Canada: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Knight J. 1994. *Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Kristofferesen R., A. Sursock and D. Westerheijden. 1998. *Manual of Quality Assurance: Procedures and Practices*. European Training Foundation.
- McBurnie G. and T. Pollack. 2000. "Decision Making for Offshore Activities: A Case Study on Monash University" in D. Davis, A. Olsen and A Bohm (Eds). *Transnational Education Providers, Partners and Policy: Challenges for Australian Institutions Offshore*. IDP Education Australia.
- McKinnon K.R., S.H. Walker and D. Davis. 1999 draft. *Benchmarking in Universities: Draft Manual*. IDP Education Australia.
- Peace Lenn, M. 1998. *GATE Certification and the IQRP: Context and Symbiosis*. Unpublished paper.
- Schofield, A. 1999. *Benchmarking in Higher Education: An International Review*. Commonwealth Higher Education Management Service. London.
- Smith A. 1994. *International Education: A question of quality*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: European Association for International Education Occasional Paper 7.
- Smith, D. 2000. "And how will I know if there is quality?". Toronto, Canada: Ontario Council of Universities.
- QAA. 1998. "Quality Assurance: A New Approach" in *Higher Quality*, No. 4, October. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.
- Taylor, E., J. Meyerson and W. Massey. 1993. *Strategic Indicators for Higher Education: Improving Performance*. Peterson's Guides. Princeton, New Jersey.

Winter de, U. (Ed). 1996 *Internationalisation and Quality Assurance: Goals, Strategies and Instruments*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: European Association for International Education. Occasional Paper No. 10.

Wit, H. de. (Ed). 1995a. *Strategies on internationalization of higher education. A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Wit, H. de. 1995b. "Education and Globalization in Europe: Current Trends and Future Developments", in *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, Vol 1.

Woodhouse D. 1996. "Quality Assurance: international trends, preoccupations and features", in *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 21, No. 4.

Woodhouse D. 1999. "Quality and Quality Assurance" in J. Knight and H. de Wit (Eds) *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education*. Paris, France: OECD/IMHE.

Wende, M. van der. 1999. "Quality Assurance of Internationalisation and Internationalisation of Quality Assurance" in J. Knight and H. de Wit (Eds). *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education*. Paris, France: OECD/IMHE.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1	4.3 Internationalization tracking measure chart	5
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1	4.4 Explanation of the chart	6
1.1 Purpose	1	4.5 Suggested tracking measures	8
1.2 Assumptions	2	4.6 Guidelines on using the tracking measures	10
1.3 Outline	2	5.0 QUALITY EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	10
2.0 QUALITY AND PROGRESS - WHAT DO WE MEAN?	2	5.1 Codes of practice	10
2.1 Quality	2	5.2 The Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE) certification process	11
2.2 Progress	3	5.3 Internationalization Quality Review Process (IQRP)	11
2.3 Evaluation of Quality	3	5.4 ISO standards	12
3.0 WHY IS QUALITY IMPORTANT?	3	5.5 Performance indicators	13
3.1 Importance in higher education sector	3	5.6 Benchmarking	14
3.2 Importance to internationalization	4	6.0 CONCLUSION	14
4.0 TRACKING MEASURES TO MONITOR INTERNATIONALIZATION	4	BIBLIOGRAPHY	15
4.1 Tracking measures in general	4		
4.2 Guiding principles	5		

## CBIE Research Millennium Series No. 2

© Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2000

Price: CBIE Members \$16  
Non-members \$20

Postage, Canada and US: add \$4  
Other countries: add \$6

ISSN: 1183-4404  
ISBN: 1-894129-26-1

Également disponible en français.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author.



Canadian Bureau for International Education  
220 Laurier Ave. W., Suite 1100, Ottawa, CANADA K1P 5Z9 Tel. (613) 237-4820 Fax: (613) 237-1073  
Web site: [www.cbie.ca](http://www.cbie.ca)